arXiv:math/0603709v2 [math.PR] 6 Apr 2006

STATIONARITY OF PURE DELAY SYSTEMS AND QUEUES WITH IMPATIENT CUSTOMERS VIA STOCHASTIC RECURSIONS

P. MOYAL

Abstract. In this paper we solve a particular stochastic recursion in the stationary ergodic framework, and propose some applications of this result to the study of regenerativity (that is, finiteness of busy cycles) and stationarity of some queueing systems: pure delay systems, in which all customers are immediately served, and queues with impatient customers. In this latter case under the FIFO discipline, we prove as well the existence of a stationary workload on an enlarged probability space.

1. Introduction

Real-time applications play a key role in the development of recent computer and telecommunications networks. In such a case the system must be able to meet severe delay requirements in the data transmission. The multimedia, time sensitive and on-line audio/video data traffic flows are subject to such temporal constraints, as well as call centers in which customers hang up if not attended after a short waiting time. Then it may be better to discard the requests which would eventually arrive too late, in order to favor some other packets which still can meet their delay requirements: they can therefore be thought as "impatient" since they may leave the system forever if not treated fast enough.

These systems are commonly referred to as *real-time queueing systems*, and represented in a random environment by *queues with impatient customers*: this is the classical stochastic model of a queueing system fed by a stationary process of arrivals, marked by the service times of the customers, enriched by a new (possibly random) parameter, the initial *patience* or *time credit* of the customers. Therefore the customers are lost forever when their patience expires before they could reach the service booth (in this case the patience is *until the beginning of service*), or even complete their service (it is then said to be *until the end of service*). The time credit of the customer decreases at unit rate as time goes on, and provided that the customer is in the system at t, his *residual time credit* at t is the remaining time before his deadline, i.e. the time already spent in the system substracted to the initial time credit.

A first question arising in the study of random dynamical systems, and in particular of queueing systems, is the one of stochastic stability. In the general stationary ergodic framework (i.e. for G/G queues), in most cases this problem is handled by studying at arrival or departure times some stochastically recursive sequence

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary : 60F17, Secondary : 60K25 and 60B12.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic recursions and Stationary solutions and Pure delay systems and Queues with impatience and Regenerativity.

$\{Y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, that is, such that for some initial conditions,

$$Y_{n+1} = \phi_n(Y_n),$$

where ϕ_n is a stationary ergodic sequence of random maps. In "good cases" (essentially, when the almost sure continuity and monotonicity of ϕ_n are assumed), backwards recurrence schemes as in [Loy62] exhibit a stationary version of $\{Y_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, which can be finite and unique depending on some condition on the parameters. In the latter case, provided that the stationary solution is possibly nonpositive and that the system is empty on $\{Y_n = 0\}$, the system is *regenerative*, i.e. it empties almost surely an infinity of times.

It is a straightforward fact, that under general G/G/ assumptions the queue with impatient customers is almost surely finite in infinite time, since its congestion process (i.e. the process counting the number of customers in the system) is dominated in a suitable sense by that of a well chosen *pure delay system*: there are an infinity of servers, so that every customer is immediately served upon arrival. The size of this latter system is known to be a.s. finite in the long run (see [BB02], Property 2.8.1.), which implies in turns the same property for the queue with impatient customers. But regenerativity or existence/uniqueness of some stationary state are all but obvious properties even for trivially finite systems (see in [Fli83] counter-examples for the workload sequence of the G/G/1/1 queue, which may admit either none or more than one stationary version), and at the time, no such strong results as have been proven for both queues with impatient customers and pure delay systems.

We believe that this lack of information is due to the strong instability of the system's dynamics. Consider for instance a queue with impatient customers treated under some service discipline depending on the time credits of the customers, say *Earliest Deadline First* (EDF for short), in which case the servers chose when available the customer with the smallest residual time credit. This discipline has been shown to be optimal for feasability (see [Der74]), instataneous loss for strong stochastic orderings ([PT88]) and loss probability in the Poissonian case ([DM03, Moy05])). In such a case, the situation (waiting time, vocation to be lost or served) of an arriving customer not only depend on the past of the system, but as well on the subsequent arrivals of prioritary customers. Therefore, so far no exhaustive description by a simple stochastically recursive sequence has been presented in the litterature. Remark, that representations by counting measure-valued processes have been proposed to study the mean flow of this queue (see [DM05], [DM06] or [DLS01]), where Dirac measures are affected to each residual time credit at current time.

Hereafter we present original descriptions of pure delay systems and queues with impatient customers at arrival times by remarkable real-valued sequences, all of them satisfying a particular recursive equation (equation **(E)** below). The study of the stationary regimes of these sequences then provide sufficient information to yield conditions of regenerativity and convergence to a stationary state for these systems.

To go one step further, in the particular case of queues with impatiences treated under the FIFO (first in, first out) discipline, we state that the workload sequence (waiting time proposed to the arriving customers) is stochastically recursive (see equation (19) below), but in this case the recursive functional ϕ_n is not monotonic.

We circumvent this difficulty using the recent techniques of enlargement of probability space (see [AK97]), which lead to the existence of a stationary version of the sequence in a weaker sense.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we investigate in the stationary ergodic framework the existence and uniqueness of a solution for the stochastic recursion **(E)**. We present applications of this result in section 3 to the study of stationarity of pure delay systems, in section 4 to queues with impatient customers until the beginning of service, and in section 5 to queues with impatient customers until the end of service. In subsection 4.2 we show the existence of a stationary workload in the case of a single-server proceeding under the FIFO discipline.

2. Stationary solution of a stochastic recursion

Consider a probability space $\left(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbf{P}^0\right)$, embedded with the measurable bijective flow θ (denote θ^{-1}, its measurable inverse). Suppose that $\mathbf{P}^0$ is stationary and ergodic under θ, *i.e.* for all $\mathfrak{A}\in\mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{P}^0\left[\theta^{-1}\mathfrak{A}\right]=\mathbf{P}^0\left[\mathfrak{A}\right]$ and $\theta\mathfrak{A}=\mathfrak{A}$ implies $\mathbf{P}^0\left[\mathfrak{A}\right]=0$ or 1. Note that according to these axioms, all θ-contracting event (such that $\mathbf{P}^0\left[\mathfrak{A}^c\cap\theta^{-1}A\right]=0$) is θ-invariant. We denote for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\theta^n=\theta\circ\theta\circ...\circ\theta$ and $\theta^{-n}=\theta^{-1}\circ\theta^{-1}\circ...\circ\theta^{-1}$, and say that two sequences of r.v. couple when there exists a $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. finite rank N such that they coincide for all $n\geq N$.

Let $\alpha\geq 0$, $\beta>0$ be two nonnegative integrable random variables (r.v. for short), and the sequences of r.v. $\left\{\alpha_n,\beta_n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}=\left\{\alpha\circ\theta^n,\beta\circ\theta^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Let Z be an a.s. finite r.v.. Consider the following stochastically recursive sequence :

$$\mathbf{(E)}\left\{\begin{array}{ll} Y_0^Z & =Z,\\ Y_{n+1}^Z & =\left[\max\left\{Y_n^Z,\alpha_n\right\}-\beta_n\right]^+ \text{ for all } n\in\mathbb{N}.\end{array}\right.$$

In this section we are interested in the existence and uniqueness of a stationary solution $\left\{Y_n^Y\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to the recursion **(E)**, in that we are looking for an a.s. finite r.v. Y such that for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$:

$$Y_n^Y=Y\circ\theta^n.$$

In particular, Y would be a solution to the equation

$$Y\circ\theta=\left[\max\left\{Y,\alpha\right\}-\beta\right]^+. \tag{1}$$

We have the following:

Theorem 1. *There exists an only $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. finite solution Y of (1), given by :*

$$Y:=\left[\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}\left(\alpha_{-j}-\sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i}\right)\right]^+. \tag{2}$$

Moreover, for all $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. finite and nonnegative r.v. Z, the sequence $\left\{Y_n^Z\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ couples with $\left\{Y\circ\theta^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. Existence We exhibit a solution Y of (1) with a backward recurrence scheme, following the ideas of the construction in [Loy62]. Define the following sequence:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} M_0=0,\\ M_n=\left[\max\limits_{j=1}^{n}\left(\alpha_{-j}-\sum\limits_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i}\right)\right]^+ \text{ for all } n\in\mathbb{N}.\end{array}\right.$$

Remark, that $\{M_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is non decreasing, since for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$M_{n+1} = \max\left\{M_n, \alpha_{-n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\beta_{-i}\right\}.$$

Thus, the $\mathbf{P}^0$-almost sure limit of $\{M_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is given by :

$$M_\infty := \left[\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}\left(\alpha_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i}\right)\right]^+.$$

On another hand, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(3)\quad M_{n+1}\circ\theta &= \left[\max\left\{\max_{j=1}^{n}\left(\alpha_{-j-1} - \sum_{i=0}^{j}\beta_{-i-1}\right),\ \alpha_{-1}-\beta_{-1}\right\}\right]^+\circ\theta\\ &= \left[\max\left\{\left[\max_{j=1}^{n}\left(\alpha_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i}\right)\right]^+\circ\theta^{-1},\ \alpha_{-1}\right\} - \beta_{-1}\right]^+\circ\theta\\ &= \left[\max\{M_n,\alpha\}-\beta\right]^+.\end{aligned}$$

The function $[\max\{.,\alpha\}-\beta]^+\circ\theta^{-1}$ being $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. continuous, we thus have :

$$M_\infty\circ\theta = \left[\max\{M_\infty,\alpha\}-\beta\right]^+,$$

hence M_∞ is a solution of (1). Now, Birkhoff ergodic Theorem ([Rob00], Theorem 10.9) entails that:

$$\frac{1}{j}\left(\alpha_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i}\right) \underset{j\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} -\mathbf{E}^0[\beta],\ \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s.}.$$

Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that :

$$\mathbf{P}^0[\mathfrak{C}_\varepsilon] := \mathbf{P}^0\left[\forall j \geq N_\varepsilon, \alpha_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i} \leq j\left(-\mathbf{E}^0[\beta]+\varepsilon\right)\right] \geq 1-\varepsilon.$$

For $\varepsilon < \min\left\{\mathbf{E}^0[\beta],1\right\}$, on $\mathfrak{C}_\varepsilon$, for all $j \geq N_\varepsilon$,

$$\alpha_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i} \leq j\left(-\mathbf{E}^0[\beta]+\varepsilon\right) < 0,$$

hence $M_\infty < \infty$. Therefore :

$$\mathbf{P}^0[M_\infty < \infty] \geq 1-\varepsilon > 0.$$

But as easily seen, $\{M_\infty = \infty\}$ is $\theta-$ invariant, hence :

$$\mathbf{P}^0[M_\infty < \infty] = 1.$$

Therefore, M_∞ provides an a.s. finite solution of (1).

Uniqueness Let Z be an $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. finite solution of (1). On the one hand, $Z \geq 0 = M_0$ $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. and $Z \geq M_n$ $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. implies:

$$Z\circ\theta = [\max\{Z,\alpha\}-\beta]^+ \geq [\max\{M_n,\alpha\}-\beta]^+ = M_{n+1}\circ\theta,\ \mathbf{P}^0 - \text{a.s.},$$

and thus $Z \geq M_{n+1}$ $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s..Therefore, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \geq M_n\right] = 1$ and to the limit :

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \geq M_\infty\right] = 1. \tag{4}$$

On another hand, we have :

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \leq \alpha\right] > 0. \tag{5}$$

Indeed, if $\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z = 0\right] > 0$, there is nothing to prove. Now if $\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z = 0\right] = 0$, $\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \leq \alpha\right] = 0$ entails that on a $\mathbf{P}^0$-almost sure event,

$$Z \circ \theta > 0 \Leftrightarrow \left[\max\left\{Z, \alpha\right\} - \beta\right]^+ > 0 \Leftrightarrow Z \circ \theta = \max\left\{Z, \alpha\right\} - \beta = Z - \beta.$$

We thus have :

$$\mathbf{E}^0\left[Z \circ \theta - Z\right] = -\mathbf{E}^0\left[\beta\right] < 0,$$

which is absurde in view of the ergodic lemma ([BB02], Lemma 2.2.1.): (5) is verified. Since

$$\left\{Z \leq \alpha\right\} = \left\{Z \circ \theta = \left[\alpha - \beta\right]^+\right\} \subseteq \left\{Z \circ \theta \leq M_\infty \circ \theta\right\},$$

(5) implies that

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \leq M_\infty\right] = \mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \circ \theta \leq M_\infty \circ \theta\right] > 0. \tag{6}$$

But on $\left\{Z \leq M_\infty\right\}$,

$$Z \circ \theta = \left[\max\left\{Z, \alpha\right\} - \beta\right]^+ \leq \left[\max\left\{M_\infty, \alpha\right\} - \beta\right]^+ = M_\infty \circ \theta,$$

which means that the event $\left\{Z \leq M_\infty\right\}$ is θ-contracting. Thus, with (6) :

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z \leq M_\infty\right] = 1,$$

and with (4) :

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[Z = M_\infty\right] = 1.$$

Coupling

Let us give the developped form of Y_n^0 for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$Y_n^0 = \left[\max_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\alpha_j - \sum_{i=j}^{n-1}\beta_i\right)\right]^+, \tag{7}$$

with the conventions $\max_{j=0}^{-1} . = 0$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{-1} . = 0$. Indeed, $Y_0^0 = 0$ and assuming (7) for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n+1}^0 &= \left[\max\left\{\left[\max_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\alpha_j - \sum_{i=j}^{n-1}\beta_i\right)\right]^+, \alpha_n\right\} - \beta_n\right]^+ \\ &= \left[\max\left\{\max_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\alpha_j - \sum_{i=j}^{n}\beta_i\right), \alpha_n - \beta_n\right\}\right]^+ = \left[\max_{j=0}^{n}\left(\alpha_j - \sum_{i=j}^{n}\beta_i\right)\right]^+. \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 \leq Z < \infty$, $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s..Remark, that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Y_n^Z = \max\left\{Z - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\beta_i, Y_n^0\right\}, \tag{8}$$

as easily seen by induction:

$$Y_0^Z = Z = \max\{Z, 0\},$$

and if (8) holds for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Y_{n+1}^Z = \left[\max\left\{Z - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\beta_i, \max_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\alpha_j - \sum_{i=j}^{n-1}\beta_i\right), \alpha_n\right\} - \beta_n\right]^+$$

$$= \max\left\{Z - \sum_{i=0}^{n}\beta_i, Y_{n+1}^0\right\}.$$

Thus,

$$\left\{Y_n^Z \neq Y_n^0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} = \left\{Y_n^Z > Y_n^0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$$

$$= \left\{Y_n^Z = Z - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\beta_i > 0 \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}.$$

But the latter event is of probability zero since it contradicts

$$\left\{\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\left(Z - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\beta_i\right) = -\mathbf{E}^0[\beta] < 0\right\},$$

which is $\mathbf{P}^0$-almost sure from Birkhoff's theorem. Hence, since two sequences driven by the same recursive equation couple from the instant when they coincide for the first time, there exists a random indice

$$\tau^{Z,0} = \inf\left\{k \in \mathbb{N}, Y_n^Z = Y_n^0 \text{ for all } n \geq k\right\} < \infty, \ \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s.}$$

This is true for any finite and nonnegative r.v. Z, and in particular for $Z = Y$. Thus, for all rank larger than $\tau^{Z,Y} := \max\left\{\tau^{Z,0}, \tau^{Y,0}\right\} < \infty$, $\left\{Y_n^Z\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\left\{Y_n^Y = Y \circ \theta^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ coincide: these two sequences couple. □

Corollary 1. *For all finite and nonnegative r.v. Z, there exists $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. an infinity of indices such that $Y_n^Z = 0$ if and only if :*

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}\left(\alpha_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\beta_{-i}\right) \leq 0\right] > 0, \tag{9}$$

Proof. in view of the previous coupling property,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{1}_{\left\{Y_i^Z=0\right\}} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y\circ\theta^i=0\}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\tau^{Z,Y}}\mathbf{1}_{\left\{Y_i^Z=0\right\}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\tau^{Z,Y}}\mathbf{1}_{\{Y\circ\theta^i=0\}}\right)$$

$$= \mathbf{P}^0[Y = 0], \ \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s..}$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\mathbf{1}_{\left\{Y_i^Z=0\right\}} = \infty, \ \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s.} \Longleftarrow \mathbf{P}^0[Y = 0] > 0,$$

which is condition (9). Now if (9) does not hold, on a $\mathbf{P}^0$-almost sure event, the sequence $\left\{Y_n^Z\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ coincides after a certain finite rank with the $\mathbb{R}+^*$-valued sequence $\left\{Y \circ \theta^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and hence never reaches 0 after this instant. This event is θ_{T_1}-invariant, and thus $\mathbf{P}$-almost sure. □

3. Stationarity of the G/G/∞ system

We hereafter consider a *pure delay* G/G/∞ system : under general stationary ergodic conditions, customers enter in a system where there is an infinite number of servers. They are consequently immediately served upon arrival, and spend in the system a time equal to the duration of their service. It has been known for a while (see for instance [BB02], p.133), that this system is stable, in the sense that its congestion process (number of customers in the system) is a.s. finite after an infinite time. In this section, we address the question of stability in terms of existence and uniqueness of a stationary version for some process describing the queueing system (here the LRST process, see below). This study will as well lead to a condition for the system to be *regenerative*, i.e., to empty a.s. an infinity of times.

On the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, we therefore define the stationary ergodic point process N, whose points $\{T_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ represent the arrivals of the customers $\{C_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$, with the convention that T_0 is the last arrival before time $t=0$. We denote $(\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, the associated measurable bijective flow, such that for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and all $\mathfrak{B}\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$:

$$N(\theta_t\omega)(\mathfrak{B}) = N(\omega)(\mathfrak{B}+t),\ \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where $\mathfrak{B}+t := \{x+t, x\in\mathfrak{B}\}$. The interarrivals, denoted for all $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ by $\xi_n = T_{n+1}-T_n$, hence form a stationary sequence of integrable r.v., and we denote $\xi := \xi_0 = T_1 - T_0$. The process N is marked by the stationary sequence $\{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ denoting the service durations requested by the customers, and the integrable r.v. $\sigma := \sigma_0$ is the service duration of customer C_0.

Let us denote $\left(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}^0, \theta\right)$, the Palm probability space of $N(\sigma)$, where $\theta := \theta_{T_1}$ is the associated bijective flow (see for example [BB02]). In particular, $\mathbf{P}^0$ is stationary and ergodic under θ, $T_0 = 0$ $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. and for all $n\in\mathbb{Z}$,

$$\xi_n = \xi\circ\theta^n \text{ and } \sigma_n = \sigma\circ\theta^n.$$

Since there is an infinite reservoir of server, the customers are immediately attended, and for instance C_n spends in the system the time σ_n necessary for his service. Provided that $T_n \le t < T_n+\sigma_n$ (i.e. C_n in the system at time t), the *remaining processing time* (that is, time before the end of service) of C_n at this instant is given by $T_n+\sigma_n-t$. Let us denote for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathfrak{X}_t = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{1}_{\{T_n\le t<T_n+\sigma_n\}},$$

the number of customers in the system at t. Provided that $\mathfrak{X}_t>0$, we denote

$$\mathfrak{R}_1(t) < \mathfrak{R}_2(t) < ... < \mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{X}_t}(t),$$

the remaining processing times of the customers in the system at t, ranked in increasing order, and

$$\mathfrak{Y}_t := \mathfrak{R}_{\mathfrak{X}_t}(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{X}_t>0\}}$$

the largest remaining processing time (LRPT for short) of a customer in the system at t (zero if the system is empty).

Let us depict the evolution of the LRPT process. If the system is empty just before the arrival time T_n ($\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-}=0$), then $\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n}=\sigma_n$, i.e. the amount of service customer C_n requires. If not ($\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-}\neq 0$), then $\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n}$ is the maximum between $\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-}$ (remaining service time of the customer who will stay in the system the latest among those present at T_n-), and the remaining service time of C_n at T_n, i.e. σ_n. Inbetween instant of arrivals, $(\mathfrak{Y}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ decreases at unit rate: at a departure time (end of a service), either there are still customers in the system, in which case the value of the LRPT is striclty positive, and doesn't jump at this time, or the customer leaving the system was alone in it, i.e. the LRPT equals zero at this instant. This dynamics is thus described by the following equation:

$$\mathfrak{Y}_t = \left[\max\left\{\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-}, \sigma_n\right\} - (t-T_n)\right]^+, \; t \in [T_n, T_{n+1}]. \tag{10}$$

Note, that $(\mathfrak{Y}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ has right continuous with left-hand limits (rcll for short) paths, and that (10) implies for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\mathfrak{Y}_{T_{n+1}-} = \left[\max\left\{\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-}, \sigma_n\right\} - \xi_n)\right]^+,$$

which is a stochastic recursion of the type of **(E)** on $\left(\Omega, \mathbf{P}^0\right)$. We aim to find a (possibly unique) r.v. $\mathfrak{Y}_0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathfrak{Y}_t(\omega) = \mathfrak{Y}_0(\theta_t\omega), \; \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s.}. \tag{11}$$

The process $(\mathfrak{Y}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ would in particular be a stationary process, being compatible with $(\theta_t)_{t\geq 0}$. We also address the question of the *regenerativity* of the queue, i.e., the almost sure infinity of instants in which the queue empties. We have the following:

Theorem 2. *There exists an only $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. finite solution $\mathfrak{Y}_0$ of (11), given by :*

$$\mathfrak{Y}_0 := \left[\sup_{n\leq 0}\left(\sigma_n + T_n\right)\right]^+. \tag{12}$$

Moreover, provided that

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[\sup_{n<0}\left(\sigma_n + T_n\right) \leq 0\right] > 0, \tag{13}$$

the system is regenerative.

Proof. From Theorem 1, there exists an unique finite r.v.

$$Y := \left[\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}\left(\sigma_{-j} - \sum_{i=1}^{j}\xi_{-i}\right)\right]^+$$

such that:

$$Y \circ \theta = \left[\max\left\{Y, \sigma\right\} - \xi\right]^+, \; \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s.}. \tag{14}$$

We thus can construct the stationary LRPT sequence $\left\{Y_n^Y\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and the corresponding stationary LRPT process $(\mathfrak{Y}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$, defining for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n^Y &= Y \circ \theta_{T_n}, \\ \mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-} &= Y_n^Y, \\ \mathfrak{Y}_t &= \left[\max\left\{Y_n^Y, \sigma_n\right\} - (t-T_n)\right]^+, \; t \in [T_n, T_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

From (14), the event

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{\mathfrak{Y}_{T_{n+1}-} = \lim_{t\to T_{n+1}, t<T_{n+1}} \mathfrak{Y}_t \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}\right\} \\ &\qquad\qquad = \left\{Y_{n+1}^Y = \left[\max\left\{Y_n^Y, \sigma_n\right\} - \xi_n\right]^+ \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

is $\mathbf{P}^0$-almost sure and θ-invariant, hence $\mathbf{P}^0$-almost sure. Thus, $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s. $(\mathfrak{Y}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is rcll, and satisfies (10).
Now, since

$$\mathfrak{Y}_0 = \left[\max\{Y\circ\theta_{T_0},\sigma\}+T_0\right]^+ = \left[\sup_{n<0}(\sigma_n+T_n)\right]^+, \ \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s..},$$

for all $n\in\mathbb{Z}$, $t\in[T_n,T_{n+1})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{Y}_0\circ\theta_t &= \left[\max\{Y\circ\theta_{T_0}\circ\theta_t,\sigma\circ\theta_t\}+T_0\circ\theta_t\right]^+\\ &= \left[\max\{\mathfrak{Y}_{T_n-},\sigma_n\}-(t-T_n)\right]^+ = \mathfrak{Y}_t,\end{aligned}$$

the process $(\mathfrak{Y}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ hence satisfies (11). On the other hand, denote for all non-negative and finite *r.v.* Z, $\{Y_n^Z\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} := \{\mathfrak{Y}^Z_{T_n-}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the LRPT sequence initially equal to Z. Provided that (13) holds, we can apply Corollary 1:

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[\text{there are an infinity of indices } n \text{ such that } Y_n^Z=0\right]=1,$$

which implies, since the latter event is θ_{T_1}-invariant, that

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\text{there are an infinity of indices } n \text{ such that } \mathfrak{Y}^Z_{T_n-}=0\right]=1.$$

The system is thus regenerative since for all t,

$$\{\mathfrak{X}_t=0\}=\{\mathfrak{Y}_t=0\}.$$

□

4. QUEUES WITH IMPATIENT CUSTOMERS UNTIL THE BEGINNING OF SERVICE

Following Barrer's notation ([Bar57]), we now consider a queue with impatient customers until the beginning of service G/G/s/s+G(b). Customers enter in a system with s non-idling servers and of infinite capacity, according to a stationary ergodic point process $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of points $\{T_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and as above we denote $\{\xi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ the stationary sequence of interarrivals. The customers request service of durations $\{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and are furthermore *impatient until the beginning of their service*, in that they leave the system if they do not reach the service booth before a given deadline : customer C_n is discarded from the system if the time he must wait in the buffer is larger than D_n (his initial *patience*, or *time credit*). He is thus eliminated forever, at time T_n+D_n. The sequences $\{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{D_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are sequences of integrable and non-negative marks of $(N_t)_{t\geq 0}$. We denote again for all $t\geq 0$, $\mathfrak{X}_t$ the number of customers in the system at t. The servers follow a non-preemptive service discipline: we therefore consider that a customer can not be eliminated anymore as soon as he enters the service booth, even though he meets his deadline during his service.

We define the Palm probability space $\left(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbf{P}^0,\theta\right)$ of the arrival process $N(\sigma,D)$, using the same notations as above.

4.1. **Regenerativity in the general case.**

. According to the asumptions made above, the total sojourn time of customer C_n does not exceed $D_n + \sigma_n$, i.e. the sum of his total patience and the time necessary for his service. On the other hand, it is at least equal to $\min\{\sigma_n, D_n\}$, i.e. the time needed for him to be lost, or immediately served. Hence, provided that C_n entered the system before t ($T_n \le t$) and even though he already left the system before t, his *remaining maximal sojourn time* at t (i.e. the remaining time before his latest possible departure time, if not already reached) is given by $[\sigma_n + D_n - (t - T_n)]^+$, whereas his *remaining minimal sojourn time* at t (i.e. the remaining time before his earliest possible departure time, if not already reached) is given by $[\min\{\sigma_n, D_n\} - (t - T_n)]^+$. Hence the *largest remaining maximal sojourn time* (LRMST for short) at t among all the customers entered before t is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_t := \max_{n=1}^{N_t} [\sigma_n + D_n - (t - T_n)]^+$$

and the largest remaining minimal sojourn time (LRmST for short) at t, by

$$\mathfrak{l}_t := \max_{n=1}^{N_t} [\min\{\sigma_n, D_n\} - (t - T_n)]^+ .$$

These two processes evolve according to the following dynamics: they decrease at unit rate inbetween arrival times (there is no possible change among customers already entered), and equal the initial maximal (resp. minimal) sojourn time of C_n at his arrival time T_n, provided that it is larger than the value of the process just before T_n. In other words, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and all $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$:

$$\mathcal{L}_t = [\max\{\mathcal{L}_{T_n-}, \sigma_n + D_n\} - (t - T_n)]^+ , \tag{15}$$

$$\mathfrak{l}_t = [\max\{\mathfrak{l}_{T_n-}, \min\{\sigma_n, D_n\}\} - (t - T_n)]^+ . \tag{16}$$

Theorem 3. *The G/G/s/s+G(b) queue is regenerative if:*

$$\mathbf{P}^0 \left[\sup_{n<0} (\sigma_n + D_n + T_n) \le 0\right] > 0, \tag{17}$$

and only if:

$$\mathbf{P}^0 \left[\sup_{n<0} (\min\{\sigma_n, D_n\} + T_n) \le 0\right] > 0. \tag{18}$$

Proof. Define for all finite nonnegative r.v. Z and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{array}{ll} L_n^Z & := \mathcal{L}_{T_n-} \\ l_n^Z & := \mathfrak{l}_{T_n-}, \end{array}$$

the LRMST (resp. LRmST) just before the arrival of customer C_n, provided that $\mathcal{L}_{T_0-} = Z$ (resp. $\mathfrak{l}_{T_0-} = Z$). The processes $(\mathcal{L}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ and $(\mathfrak{l}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ have rcll paths, hence in view of equations (15) and (16), we have the following recursive equations:

$$L_{n+1}^Z = \left[\max\left\{L_n^Z, \sigma_n + D_n\right\} - \xi_n\right]^+ ,$$

$$l_{n+1}^Z = \left[\max\left\{l_n^Z, \min\{\sigma_n, D_n\}\right\} - \xi_n\right]^+ .$$

On $\left(\Omega, \mathbf{P}^0\right)$ the two latter equations are of type **(E)**, hence similarly to the argument of the previous proof, corollary 1 implies that there are $\mathbf{P}$-a.s. an infinity of indices such that $L_n^Z = 0$ if and only if (17) holds, and an infinity of indices such that $l_n^Z = 0$

if and only if (18) holds. We conclude remarking that for all initial conditions and all $t \geq 0$:

$$\{\mathcal{L}_t = 0\} \subseteq \{\mathfrak{X}_t = 0\} \subseteq \{\mathfrak{l}_t = 0\}.$$

□

4.2. **The G/G/1/1+G(b)-FIFO case.**

. Let us now consider the special case, where there is one server proceeding according to the FIFO (*First in, first out*) order. Denote for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathfrak{W}_t$ the workload submitted to the server at time t, i.e. the quantity of work he still has to achieve at this time, in time unit. The process $(\mathfrak{W}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ (already investigated in [BH81] and [BBH84] for the renewal case) has rcll paths, and we define for all n, $W_n = \mathfrak{W}_{T_n^-}$. Its value at t equals the work brought by the customers arrived up to t, and who will eventually be served, since the other ones won't ever reach the server. Under the FIFO discipline, the served customers are those who find a workload less than their patience upon arrival. Inbetween arrival times, $(\mathfrak{W}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ decreases at unit rate. Hence, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$:

$$\mathfrak{W}_t = \left[\mathfrak{W}_{T_n-} + \sigma_n \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{W}_{T_n-} \leq D_n\}} - (t - T_n)\right]^+,$$

whereas the workload sequence obeys the following recursive equation

$$W_{n+1} = \left[W_n + \sigma_n \mathbf{1}_{\{W_n \leq D_n\}} - \xi_n\right]^+. \tag{19}$$

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let W_n^0 be the workload seen by C_n upon arrival, provided that C_0 enters an empty system (that is, $W_0^0 = 0$). We have the following:

Lemma 1. *For all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$W_n^0 \leq L_n^0, \quad \mathbf{P}^0\text{-}a.s..$$

Proof. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, on the event $\left\{W_n^0 \leq L_n^0\right\}$,

- If $D_n < W_n$ and $L_n^0 \leq D_n + \sigma_n$, then
$$L_{n+1}^0 = [\sigma_n + D_n - \xi_n]^+ \geq \left[W_n^0 - \xi_n\right]^+ = W_{n+1}^0.$$
- If $D_n \geq W_n^0$ and $Y_n^0 \leq D_n + \sigma_n$, we have
$$L_{n+1}^0 = [\sigma_n + D_n - \xi_n]^+ \geq \left[W_n^0 + \sigma_n - \xi_n\right]^+ = W_{n+1}^0.$$
- If $D_n < W_n^0$ and $L_n^0 > D_n + \sigma_n$, then
$$L_{n+1}^0 = \left[L_n^0 - \xi_n\right]^+ \geq \left[W_n^0 - \xi_n\right]^+ = W_{n+1}^0.$$
- Finally, $D_n \geq W_n^0$ and $L_n^0 > D_n + \sigma_n$ yields
$$L_{n+1}^0 = \left[L_n^0 - \xi_n\right]^+ \geq [D_n + \sigma_n - \xi_n]^+ \geq \left[W_n^0 + \sigma_n - \xi_n\right]^+ = W_{n+1}^0.$$

Therefore, in any case $L_{n+1}^0 \geq W_{n+1}^0$: since $L_0^0 = W_0^0$ $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s., by induction $L_n^0 \geq W_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{P}^0$-a.s.. □

On $\left(\Omega, \mathbf{P}^0\right)$, let $\phi\{.\}$ be the measurable random map from $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ into itself (we denote $\phi \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{R})$) defined by

$$\phi(\omega)\{y\} = \left[y + \sigma(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\{y \leq D(\omega)\}} - \xi(\omega)\right]^+.$$

Equation (19) can thus be rewritten as :

$$W_{n+1} = \phi\left(\theta^n.\right)\{W_n\}, \quad \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s..} \tag{20}$$

In addition to the previous result of regenerativity (Theorem 3), we investigate in this particular case the existence of a stationary solution for the stochastic recursion (20), i.e. a finite r.v. W such that $W\circ\theta=\phi\{W\}$. As opposed to equation (1) for instance, the construction of such a solution is complexified by the non-monotonicity of the function ϕ in the state variable, in which case a construction of Loynes's type becomes fruitless. Nevertheless, it turns out to be possible to find a "weaker" stationary solution, that is, defined on an enlarged probability space. To this end, we follow the steps of the construction presented in [AK97] : on the product probability space $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$, we define the shift $\tilde{\theta}$ by

$$\tilde{\theta}(\omega,x)=(\theta\omega,\phi(\omega)\{x\}).$$

We then have:

Theorem 4. *The stochastic recursion (20) admits a* weak solution*, that is, a $\tilde{\theta}$-invariant probability $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^0$ on $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ whose Ω-marginal is $\mathbf{P}^0$. Therefore, on $(\Omega\times\mathbb{R})$ there exists a $\mathbb{R}\times\mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{R})$-valued r.v. $\left(\tilde{W},\tilde{\phi}\right)$ satisfying:*

$$\tilde{W}\circ\tilde{\theta}=\tilde{\phi}\left\{\tilde{W}\right\}.$$

In particular, $\left\{\left(\tilde{W},\tilde{\phi}\right)\circ\tilde{\theta}^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is stationary under $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^0$, and $\left\{\tilde{\phi}\circ\tilde{\theta}^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ has the same distribution as $\{\phi\circ\theta^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. From Theorem 1, $\left\{L_n^0\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ couples with $\{L\circ\theta^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where

$$L:=\left[\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}^*}\left(\sigma_{-j}+D_{-j}-\sum_{i=1}^{j}\xi_{-i}\right)\right]^+.$$

Therefore this sequence tends in distribution to Y: it is in particular tight, which implies with Lemma 1 that $\left\{W_n^0\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight, since for all $\varepsilon>0$, there exists M_ε such that for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[W_n^0\leq M_\varepsilon\right]\geq\mathbf{P}^0\left[L_n^0\leq M_\varepsilon\right]\geq 1-\varepsilon.$$

Define now on $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ the random variables :

$$\tilde{W}(\omega,x):=x,\ \ \tilde{\phi}\,(\omega,x):=\phi(\omega),$$

and for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{W}_n(\omega,x):=\tilde{W}\left(\tilde{\theta}^n(\omega,x)\right).$$

Remark that for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{A}\in\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathfrak{B}\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\left[\tilde{\theta}^{-n}\left(\mathfrak{A}\times\mathbb{R}\right)\right]=\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\left[\mathfrak{A}\times\mathbb{R}\right]=\mathbf{P}^0\left[\mathfrak{A}\right]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\left[\tilde{\theta}^{-n}\left(\Omega\times\mathfrak{B}\right)\right]&=\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\left[\tilde{\theta}^{-n}\left(\tilde{W}_0^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})\right)\right]\\&=\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\left[\tilde{W}_n^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})\right]=\mathbf{P}^0\left[W_n^0\in\mathfrak{B}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the probability distributions $\left\{\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\circ\tilde{\theta}^{-n}\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ on $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}$ have Ω-marginal $\mathbf{P}^0$ and $\mathbb{R}$-marginals the distributions of $\left\{W_n^0\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, which form a tight sequence : the sequence $\left\{\mathbf{P}^0\otimes\delta_0\circ\tilde{\theta}^{-n}\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight. We can therefore apply Theorem 1 of [AK97] : there exists a $\tilde{\theta}$-invariant probability $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^0$ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ whose Ω-marginal is $\mathbf{P}^0$. It is now straightforward that :

$$\tilde{W}_n(\omega, x) = \phi\left(\theta^{n-1}\omega\right) \circ \phi\left(\theta^{n-2}\omega\right) \circ ... \circ \phi(\omega)\{x\},$$

$$\tilde{\phi} \circ \tilde{\theta}^n(\omega, x) = \phi \circ \theta^n(\omega),$$

hence the sequence $\left\{\tilde{W}_n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ the stochastic recursion:

$$\tilde{W}_{n+1} = \tilde{\phi} \circ \tilde{\theta}^n \left\{\tilde{W}_n\right\},$$

where $\left\{\tilde{W}_n, \tilde{\phi} \circ \tilde{\theta}^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is stationary under $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^0$. □

5. Queues with impatient customers until the end of service

. Let us now consider a G/G/s/s+G(e) queue : the model is that of the previous section, except that the customers are now assumed to remain impatient until the end of their service. Indeed, they leave the system, and are eliminated forever provided that their service is not *completed* before their deadline. Keeping the notations and other assumptions of the previous section, customer C_n is thus dicarded when the total time he has to wait in the buffer and spend in the service booth is larger than his initial time credit D_n. To avoid the trivial case, where a customer can not even wait for the end of his own service (in which case he is automaticaly rejected), we furthermore assume that $D_n \geq \sigma_n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In this case, as easily seen the LRMST and LRmST processes are respectively given for all t by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_t &:= \max_{n=1}^{N_t} \left[D_n - (t - T_n)\right]^+ \\ \mathfrak{l}_t :&= \max_{n=1}^{N_t} \left[\sigma_n - (t - T_n)\right]^+, \end{aligned}$$

and obey the following dynamics: for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and all $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_t &= \left[\max\left\{\mathcal{L}_{T_n-}, D_n\right\} - (t - T_n)\right]^+ \\ \mathfrak{l}_t &= \left[\max\left\{\mathfrak{l}_{T_n-}, \sigma_n\right\} - (t - T_n)\right]^+. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, similar arguments as those of section 4.1 lead to the following result:

Theorem 5. *The G/G/s/s+G(b) queue is regenerative if:*

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[\sup_{n<0}\left(D_n + T_n\right) \leq 0\right] > 0,$$

and only if:

$$\mathbf{P}^0\left[\sup_{n<0}\left(\sigma_n + T_n\right) \leq 0\right] > 0.$$

On the other hand, in the special case G/G/1/1+G(e) under the FIFO discipline, a customer is served provided that the workload he finds upon arrival doesn't exceed the time he agrees to wait in the buffer, i.e. $D_n - \sigma_n$. Hence, the process $(\mathfrak{W}_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$:

$$\mathfrak{W}_t = \left[\mathfrak{W}_{T_n-} + \sigma_n \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{W}_{T_n-} \leq D_n - \sigma_n\}} - (t - T_n)\right]^+,$$

and the workload sequence satisfies the recursive equation:

$$W_{n+1} = \psi\left(\theta^n.\right)\left\{W_n\right\}, \quad \mathbf{P}^0\text{-a.s.,} \tag{21}$$

where

$$\psi(\omega)\,\{y\} = \left[y + \sigma(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\{y \leq D(\omega)-\sigma(\omega)\}} - \xi(\omega)\right]^{+}.$$

We define the following shift on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$\check{\theta}(\omega, x) = (\theta\omega, \psi(\omega)\{x\}).$$

As above, denote for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, W_n^0 (resp. L_n^0) the workload (resp. LRMST) found by customer C_n provided that the system was empty at T_0-. Then, for all n $W_n^0 \leq L_n^0$, as easily checked taking $D_n := D_n - \sigma_n$ in Lemma 1. Hence Theorem 1 of [AK97] can still be applied and leads to:

Theorem 6. *The stochastic recursion (21) admits a weak solution* $\check{\mathbf{P}}^0$ *on* $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. *In particular, there exists a* $\mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{R})$*-valued r.v.* $\left(\check{W}, \check{\psi}\right)$ *satisfying:*

$$\check{W} \circ \check{\theta} = \check{\psi}\left\{\check{W}\right\},$$

$\left\{\left(\check{W}, \check{\psi}\right) \circ \check{\theta}^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is stationary under* $\check{\mathbf{P}}^0$, *and* $\left\{\check{\psi} \circ \check{\theta}^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *has the same distribution as* $\left\{\psi \circ \theta^n\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

REFERENCES

[AK97] V. Anantharam and T. Konstantopoulos. Stationary solutions of stochastic recursions describing discrete time events. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 68:181–194, 1997.

[Bar57] D. Y. Barrer. Queuing with impatient customers and ordered service. *Operations Res.*, 5:650–656, 1957.

[BB02] F. Baccelli and P. Brémaud. *Elements of queueing theory.* Springer, 2 edition, 2002.

[BBH84] F. Baccelli, P. Boyer, and G. Hébuterne. Single-server queues with impatient customers. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 16(4):887–905, 1984.

[BH81] F. Baccelli and G. Hébuterne. On queues with impatient customers. In *Performance'81*, pages 159–179, 1981.

[Der74] M. Dertouzos. Control robotics: The procedural control of physical processus. In *Proc. IFIP Congress*, 1974.

[DLS01] B. Doytchinov, J.P. Lehoczky, and S. Shreve. Real-time queues in heavy-traffic with earliest deadline first queue discipline. *Ann. of Appl. Probab.*, 11(2):332–378, 2001.

[DM03] L. Decreusefond and P. Moyal. Elements for the study of stability and performances in real time queues. In *IEEE proceedings ICT'03*, pages 1126–1132, 2003.

[DM05] L. Decreusefond and P. Moyal. Fluid limit of the M/M/1/1+GI-EDF queue. In *IEEE proceedings Symposium on Applications and the Internet Workshops 05*, pages 248–251, 2005.

[DM06] L. Decreusefond and P. Moyal. The fluid limit of a heavily loaded EDF queue with impatient customers. In *arxiv PR/0512660*, 2006.

[Fli83] D. Flipo. Steady state of loss systems. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, (297,6), 1983.

[Loy62] R.M. Loynes. The stability of queues with non-independent interarrivals and service times. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 58:497–520, 1962.

[Moy05] P. Moyal. *Contributions à l'étude des files d'attente avec clients impatients.* PhD Dissertation, École Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications, 2005.

[PT88] S. Panwar and D. Towsley. Optimal scheduling policies for a class of queues with customer deadlines to the beginning of service. *Journal of the ACM.*, 35(4):832–844, 1988.

[Rob00] Ph. Robert. *Réseaux et files d'attente: méthodes probabilistes.* Springer, 2000.

CEREMADE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS DAUPHINE, PARIS, 75016, FRANCE
E-mail address: `Pascal.Moyal@ceremade.dauphine.fr`